

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/542,473 04/04/00 IKEDA T 0756-2138 **EXAMINER** 022204 MM92/0502 NIXON PEABODY, LLP SEFER, A 8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT SUITE 800 MCLEAN VA 22102 2826 **DATE MAILED:** 05/02/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Office Action Summary Examiner	Applicant(s) IKEDA ET AL. Art Unit 2826
Office Action Summary Examiner	Art Unit 2826
Examiner	2826
Ahmed N Sefer	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the col	rrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(STHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be time after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, proclosed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 49	
Disposition of Claims	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10 and 15-20</u> is/are pending in the application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-7,10,15,17,18 and 20</u> is/are rejected.	
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3,4,8,9,16 and 19</u> is/are objected to.	
8) Claims are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	·
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.	
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapp	proved.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application	on No
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been receive application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not receive 	ed in this National Stage
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	
Attachment(s)	
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summar	ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/542,473

Art Unit: 2826

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, 15, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yudasaka et al. US Patent No. 5,953,582 in view of Kobayashi et al. US Patent No. 5,767,930.

Yudasaka et al disclose in fig 37D a display device having a pixel portion and a driver circuit portion on the same substrate 701, wherein an active layer of a pixel TFT formed in said pixel portion has a low concentration impurity region 832b, 833b, a channel forming region 831, and a high concentration impurity region 832a, 833a which are formed between a source region 832 and a drain region 833, wherein said channel forming region and said high concentration impurity region are formed under a gate electrode, and a region of low concentration impurity that does not overlap with the gate electrode (as in claim 6) but does not disclose that said low concentration impurity region partially overlaps with said gate electrode with a gate insulating film interposed therebetween. However, Kobayashi et al disclose a low concentration impurity region 18 overlaps (partially overlaps) with a gate electrode 14 with a gate insulating film 3 interposed therebetween (as in claims 1,15 and 18) (see figure 9 and col. 16, lines 45-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the

Application/Control Number: 09/542,473

Art Unit: 2826

invention was made to have designed between a region of low concentration impurity overlapping with a gate electrode and a gate insulating film interposed in between so as to improve the withstand drain voltage of the driver circuit thereby increasing its power source.

As to the two channel forming regions or the high concentration impurity regions formed between the channel forming regions recited in claims 15 and 18, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to as "merely a matter of obvious engineering choice", since the integration of multiple pieces into one piece or conversely, using multiple pieces in replacing a single piece or rearranging elements within a device does not carry any patentable weight.

In regards to claims 2 and 7, Yudasaka et al disclose low and high concentration impurity regions that contain phosphorous within the range of the claimed concentration (see col. 36, lines 3-10).

As for claims 5,10,17 and 20, the prior art omits that electronic equipment selected from the group consisting of a video camera, a digital camera and other various electronic equipment. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that an electronic equipment comprising a display device wherein said electronic equipment selected from the group consisting of a video camera or a digital camera is conventional and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used any of the various electronic equipment since Examiner takes Official Notice that due to their low power consumption, displays have become a necessary and indispensable structural element of an electronic equipment.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 3,4,8,9,16 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ahmed N Sefer whose telephone number is (703) 605-1227.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J Flynn can be reached on (703) 308-6601.

ANS April 12, 2001

> Nathan Flynn Primary Examine